

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 15, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 15, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 22-25 are pending in the application. Claims 22-25 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 22-25 have been amended for clarification. Applicant submits that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22 to 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as being incomplete for omitting essential features, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01 and 2164.08(c). The claims have been amended for clarification. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in light of the amendments, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In particular, the Examiner argues that the preamble should not be given patentable weight and accordingly rejects a claim which is construed without the limitations of the preamble. However, Applicants' respectfully submit that the body of the claim refers back to the preamble by using the preamble for antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the preamble should be given patentable weight. Nevertheless, in an effort to move prosecution forward, Applicants have made an amendment which is believed to ensure that proper consideration and patentable weight are given to limitations previously not considered by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the scope of the claims remains unchanged and that therefore, the claims, as amended, are entitled to a full range of equivalents.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the admitted known prior art disclosed in the specification at page 3, lines 1 to 16 and page 4, lines 3 to 23. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the present rejection, the Examiner states that “The admitted known prior art teaches as is disclosed in the specification at page 3, lines 1 to 16 and page 4, lines 3 to 23. In view of the interpretation of the claims set forth above under the heading Claim Interpretation applicants' invention, as claimed, does not distinguish over the process of the admitted known prior art.”

As noted above, the pending claims have been amended for clarification. Applicants respectfully submit that the present rejection is moot in light of the amendments, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/
Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)

474765_1